CCR Education Sub-Workgroup Meeting
May 2, 2017,
Meeting Notes
744 P St., Sacramento, CA 95814, OB9 Room 203

Purpose: To discuss how education system (the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA), Foster Youth Services and General Education) interplays with Child Welfare, Probation and Mental Health systems in the implementation of CCR.

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I. **Welcome and Introductions** **Stuart Oppenheim**, Child and Family Policy Institute of California (CFPIC)/ **Ahmed Nemr**, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)	• Participants: (in-person and via phone) – **CA Alliance:** Danielle Tenner, Jill Rowland, Carroll Schroeder, Jennifer Rexroad; – **Breaking Barriers**: Maureen Burness; Elizabeth Estes; – **CDSS:** Ahmed Nemr, Sara Rogers, Rebecca Buchmiller, Theresa Thurmond, Tracy Urban, Sara Davis, Fantoya Hill, Caroline Caton, Loretta Miller; Lori Fuller, Mai Yer Vang, – **CFPIC:** Stuart Oppenheim; – **County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA):** Callie Freitag; Diana Boyer; – **East Bay Children's Law Offices:** Haley Fagan; – **Fresno County Department of Social Services:** Dalvin Baker, Tricia Gonzalez; – **Health & Human Services Agency, SD:** Melinda Verbon; – **Los Angeles Department of Children and Family Services:** Patricia Armani; – **Nat'l. Ctr. for Youth law:** Minsun Meeker; – **LA County Probation:** Felicia Davis; – **DMH, LA:** Robert Byrd; – **Public Counsel - Children's Rights Project:** Martha Matthews; – **Sacramento County:** Cynthia Vanzant; Trish Kennedy; Melissa Jacobs; – **San Bernardino County CFS:** Lori-Anne Elinsky, Francesca Villarreal; – **SELPA:** Veronica Coates, Elinsky Lori-Anne, Jim Voss, Mindy Fattig, Anjanette Pelletier, Conde Kunzman; – **Shasta COE:** Heidi Brahmas, Tonya Marshall; – **Tulare County Child Welfare Services:** Laurel Hernandez.	

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
II. **CCR Education Sub-Workgroup Background and Progress.** – Sara Rogers, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)	A brief recap of the purpose and history of this workgroup was provided for new attendees: • In moving towards the CCR implementation, the State/County Team has been meeting to help move our system towards more home-based settings and improving congregant care when it is needed. The State/County Team has provided a multi-disciplinary conversation that has led to clarifying statutory components of CCR and how we can work together at the state and local level. The Team has recently been focusing on how we can make CCR real at the local level; recognized how important it is to integrate education into this conversation. Then began working with CDE, SELPA, local school districts to do this. • Conversations have begun regarding funding for SELPA's and the impact of CCR changes. • The goal is to find concrete solutions how the systems work together and the opportunities for true integration in our various processes. There is also broadened participation to key stakeholders who are advocating for youth. • This group can identify opportunities and challenges and come up with strategies for addressing them. • One area is to consider how the systems use the same providers differently. On agenda today are two areas where this is being addressed; youth with complex needs cannot be addressed by one system alone yet pose a challenge to the systems for collaboration on how do we ensure that we have the right providers to address these needs. The Multi-Disciplinary Team model offers an opportunity for seeing how the systems can work together. Another on-going conversation is building a framework for dealing with inter-departmental challenges, i.e., a CCR Ed toolkit for local agencies and partnerships to help local systems bolster their collaboration by using a set of model tools -model Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). • Hope that we can identify where things are not working and then address how to make them work. • Q: Is this group still concerned with the SELPA funding issue? • A: This issue is something that needs to occur first among state agencies and then maybe can be addressed in a broader forum such as this. We can still talk about funding. A small workgroup of advocates is working on the SELPA issue and will report back to this group in the future—after June 15.	– SELPA funding workgroup report out on 6/29.
III. **Youth with Complex Needs Overview.** Lisa Witchey/Christina	– Lisa Witchey, Bureau Chief with the Out-of-State Placement Policy Unit provided a background on the High Needs Workgroup: Counties and CDSS have struggled with issue of how to serve youth with complex needs which-	

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
Oliver, CDSS	leads to long stays in shelter, out- of- state placements, and multiple placement changes. The Participation in High Needs Workgroup consists of members from CDE, CWDA, CBHDA, CPOC, and county staff. The group has looked at models such as "no reject, no eject" policy (No one is ever refused services or discharged from service due to their previous history or reluctance to engage in the program); this model was presented by New Jersey on their system reform and development of robust system of care to help reduce congregant care including mobile crisis response. The workgroup is continuing to explore these areas. One of the deliverables has been to have-conversations with all stakeholders, including providers, to identify barriers and try to address those barriers. These are currently being discussed at CCR RITE meetings to clearly understand barriers and think about solutions. – **Today would like to hear from Education about how Education fits into the issue of addressing youth with complex needs:** One example is where CWS brings a child back to the county to a home that is not viable and leads to a child roaming the streets; the child is assessed by Education as being at danger and then Education places them out of state. In the past voluntary Wraparound has helped but that has disappeared in that county. How can Individualized Educational Program (IEP) be strengthened to support youth with complex needs? Some conversation has been around the fact that IEP's are outdated, restricting the ability of CWS and Probation to get services in place. Placement changes can also result in an IEP not being completed according to the required timelines or youth is placed where the needed services are not available. Coordination of care can be a problem when-children are placed in a new location where services may not be available; Placement decisions are made without consulting with Education. Sometimes all three agencies have a hard time finding placements. There are several areas that need to be addressed. One inherent problem with short term nature of STRTP; how does the MH work get done while the child is at school for most of the day; if STRTP placement is for six months and the IEP takes three months, the time frames can be a problem. Some placements would benefit from Non-Public School (NPS), but if no IEP then they cannot qualify for the NPS. Sometimes the youth is doing fine in regular school but the group home wants to put in NPS, this violates the least-restrictive placement requirement in law. As congregate care placements are moving to STRTP's there is more pressure to work with placements that require an NPS. Information sharing needs to be expedited to make sure that processes occur in a timely fashion. CDSS is looking at Program Statements to make sure that the question of access to public school is addressed. Providers should be part of that conversation.	

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	The availability of resources in all locations is a problem that calls for a regional approach to identifying and developing appropriate resources when children are place. How can education be more involved in the placement decisions that are made by Interagency Placement Committee (IPC), Child and Family Team (CFT)? Statutory changes for information-sharing would help. The IPC is a great opportunity for integrating education. The discretion of the parent in inviting people to the CFT may prevent the identification of education participants. LA is starting to address education issues at the detention phase, letting the parent know that the child has the right to remain in their school of origin. Also reaching out to the school district to engage them in these discussions. One issue that is very problematic is when a child/youth comes into the county without the knowledge of the SELPA or Child Welfare/Probation. Immediate school placement, which should occur, does not occur because there is not enough information about the child. There is an existing MOU that allows for some information sharing but it should include Probation, MH, others. Placement decision-making meetings should benefit from one another's participation. We need a communications network. CDSS is working on an information-sharing letter that can incorporate some of the ideas that have been to build Memorandums of Understandings, processes, etc. These MOUs could be modeled in conjunction with CWDA, CDE, CDSS, etc. There is a bill pending that will ameliorate some of the confidentiality barriers in relation to education for the caregivers. Processes that offer opportunities for local and regional collaboration among systems and providers as mentioned above could be woven into the local Program Statement review processes. This will empower local agencies to tell providers what they need and empower providers to say what they can provide. Could there be some specific recommendations to guide the local Program Statement Review process to be included in the Education Toolkit that is being discussed today. Also important for CWS and Probation to understand what Education needs from the placing agency and should be included in the toolkit. It would be good to bring in concrete examples of things that have been done. Overall, there is a -need for early information sharing and early teaming. <u>All thoughts or opportunities that people can identify should be sent to Lisa Witchey at Lisa.Witchey@dss.ca.gov</u>.	– Ahmed will send out the All County Letter (ACL) No.16-75 Foster Youth Data Shared with California Department of Education and that MOU.
IV. **San Mateo** **Multidisciplinary Team**	San Mateo MDT Model (See the PowerPoint provided). 2 Collaborative: 1. Watch Me Grow	

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
Model, Anjanette Pelletier, San Mateo SELPA	2. Children and Youth System of Care---success based on an agreement to share resources across Departments. CDSS has issued a model MOU in the past that addressed how to share resources to support Foster Youth Education. Any questions can be addressed to Anjanette Pelletier at apelletier@smcoe.org.	
V. **CCR Education Toolkit Discussion** **Richard Knecht**, CDSS	• Richard Knecht talked about the development of a toolkit that will offer tools to counties as models for collaborative processes. This grew out of a cross-departmental discussion about putting together a web-based toolkit that Education and Child Welfare can use. • Would this group like to put together a workgroup that can put together existing resources from Education and CCR to create an on-line resource portal? This could post successful collaborative models that guide counties in creating early intervention strategies that many counties are using and be universally accessible for agencies to be able to communicate with each other. CDE has a website with an existing platform that could house this effort. Need a mechanism to keep it fresh. Would link to CalSWEC and CIBHS and others to make sure it reflects a "no wrong door" approach. • Focus should be on solutions—not just to identify problems but to identify how to address them. Good to build on existing resources that are already available (Equal Futures, e.g.) Minsun will provide a link to the Equal Futures website. The website is more geared to LEA professionals but we may want to use some of the resources. • Two examples: Background information on multi-tiered levels of support (MTSS); guidance on Child and Family Teaming; MOU template and other local resources. • Volunteers: Patty Armani, Minsun Meeker, Robert Byrd, Felicia Davis (LA), San Bernardino • First meeting will set scope of the work of the meeting and then people can opt in or out. The first meeting will be held later in May.	− If you are interested in volunteering please email Ahmed Nemr at Ahmed.Nemr@dss.ca.gov
VI. **Integrating Education and Child Welfare Case Management** **Minsun Meeker,** National Center for Youth Law, LA	(See the PowerPoint provided). • Q. Is there a plan to take this to scale? • A: In other states—it is piloted in individual counties in order to roll out statewide (Indiana, Arizona, and New Mexico). • Piloted in CA in Santa Cruz—integrated into County Office of Education. Hope to do it locally vs. statewide roll-out. • How would additional pilots be funded? NYCL can bring some funders to the table to pilot, with some contributions from the public sector. Some districts are using LCAP funds.	

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	Monterey is applying for Prop 47 funds. NYCL approaches districts to begin the work initially; some other districts have approached them to begin the work. • How could this be used to disseminate best practices for counties to adopt? Possible to share using the toolkit mentioned above. • MHSA may also be a source of resources available to counties to replicate this kind of work • Other technical assistance being done at state level that is of interest. CDE Foster Youth Services has two technical assistance providers (Shasta and Orange). Shasta has met with 12 counties (CWS and COE) to talk about co-location, collaboration and leveraging Title-IV-E resources. This has resulted in programs similar to the one that Minsun described. The Foster Youth Services staff can act as bridge between education and CWS. This model is being looked at as a promising practice and being implemented statewide. A CDE website is being developed - Collaboration in Common - Foster Youth Services will be offering practice guides (can look at template now at collaboration in common). A more formal presentation about this T/A work will be provided at our next meeting.	– A more formal presentation by Foster Youth Services about this T/A work will be provided at the next meeting.
VI. CFT/Ed Small Workgroup Report out, Veronica Coates, Tehama County, SELPA	• The small work group has met in April and included general education partners on how CFT/IEP overlap. Reaching out to other partners... The previous presentation can help inform the work that they can do. Because of the differences in the various school districts the group cannot prescribe the specifics of how each District should handle the collaboration.	
VI. **Next Steps** Stuart Oppenheim, CFPIC Ahmed Nemr, CDSS	• Next Meeting Agenda: – Information Sharing, Reviewing the information-sharing letters that have been distributed to bring these two policies together and compare them, Include other documents about information sharing from other sources (Judicial Council, etc.), other county information sharing documents and Interagency MOU. – Update on Educational Toolkit – Small Workgroup Report Out – Foster Youth Services T/A – 6/29 10-2:30	

6